

## **REMARKS**

The unclear portion of the specification has been amended to avoid the problem noted by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 10, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Muller in view McLean. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Muller in view of McLean further in view of Feldkamper.


New claims are presented. New claim 16 distinguishes over Muller at least by reciting a conveyor table which is pivotable and having a length adjustable parallel to the conveying direction of the sheet-like objects being stored by the storage film. This change in length can be seen by comparing Applicants' Fig. 1 and the distance between shafts 38 and 58 and the decreased distance between the same two shafts in Fig. 2 such that the conveyor table has its length decreased from Fig. 1 to Fig. 2 as the table rotates about pivot shaft 38. Muller discloses nothing like this, since the distance between Muller's shaft 9 and shaft 8 remains the same, and there is no change in length of the conveying table for the sheets being stored in the roll 18.

The secondary reference of McLean was only cited for a housing. Also the secondary reference of Feldkamper also shows no length change of the conveying table in the direction of the sheet conveying. Thus claim 16 readily distinguishes. Dependent claims 17-22 also distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 16 and also by reciting additional features not suggested in combination.

Additional independent claims 23 and 24 distinguish in a manner similar to claim 16.

Allowance of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
(Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet

**SCHIFF HARDIN LLP**

Patent Department - **CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

6600 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 258-5786

Attorneys for Applicant